1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

KATHLEEN BLISS, on behalf of herself, the Proposed Nationwide Rule 23 Class, and the Proposed Nevada Subclass,

Case No. 2:18-cv-01280-JAD-EJY

ORDER

Plaintiff,

CORECIVIC, INC.,

v.

Defendant.

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Seal Documents (ECF No. 194), which seeks to seal exhibits filed with Plaintiff's Reply in Support of her Motion to Compel. The Motion references Exhibits L, M, N, O, P, Q, S, T, U, V, and W, all but one of which was marked "Confidential" by Defendant and produced under the Stipulated Protective Order.

As the party seeking to seal a judicial record, Plaintiff would ordinarily be required to meet the burden of overcoming the strong presumption in favor of access and public policies favoring disclosure. Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that those who seek to maintain the secrecy of documents attached to non-dispositive motions must demonstrate "good cause" supporting secrecy). Where a party seeks to seal documents attached to a non-dispositive motion, such as a motion to compel, the "public policies that support the right of access to dispositive motions ... do not apply with equal force" Kamakana, 417 F.3d at 1179 (citation omitted). However, existence of a stipulated protective order and either party's designation of a document as confidential alone are insufficient grounds to seal a document. Heath v. Tristar Prod., Inc., Case No. 2:17-cv-02869-GMN-PAL, 2019 WL 12311995, at *2 (D. Nev. Apr. 17, 2019).

A review of the documents demonstrates that Exhibits M, Q, S, T, U, V, and W contain proprietary and confidential information that is properly sealed. In contrast, Exhibits L, N, O, and

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Case 2:18-cv-01280-JAD-EJY Document 195 Filed 05/09/22 Page 2 of 2